

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated December 7, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 7, 2006. Applicants respectfully request entry and consideration of the above noted amendments and the following remarks in response to the Office Action.

CLAIM REJECTIONS:

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended the dependency of claim 16. Applicants further submit that the tenacity measurement of the slit film (g/den) is a correct measurement, as the "slit-film" is a fiber as known to one skilled in the art, which possesses a denier measurement. Applicants have clarified the scope of the independent claims to recite slit-film. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-21 and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0183975 A1 (*Gownder*.) Applicants submit that amendments to the pending claims hereby obviate the rejection and respectfully request withdrawal thereof.

Claims 1-14 and 17-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0013870 (*Sheldon*.) The Office Action states that it appears from the instant specification that woven products of a tape comprising isotactic polypropylene having a tenacity of at least about 2.5 g/den typically exhibit a tenacity of within about 10.0% of the tenacity of the film product. However, the Office Action does not recite how *Sheldon* teaches, shows or suggests such a feature. There must be some teaching in the prior art reference to anticipate a claim. Further, the statement of the Office Action is construing the present invention, which is referenced at page 14, as a teaching of the prior art. Paragraph 14 of the specification is clearly describing the features of the present invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-20 and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by, or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious, over U.S. Pat. No. 6,096,843


(*Saito*.) Applicants submit that amendments to the pending claims hereby obviate the rejection and respectfully request withdrawal thereof.

Claims 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 5,393,598 (*Shlecker*) in view of *Gownder*. A prior invention which would otherwise be prior art under 35 USC §102(e) is not prior art to determine obviousness if the prior invention and the claimed invention were both, at the time the claimed or later invention was made, owned by the same entity or subject to an obligation to assign to the same entity. *See*, 35 U.S.C. §103, third paragraph. *Gownder* is assigned to Fina Technology, Inc., which is the assignee in the pending application. Therefore, *Gownder* is not a §102(e) reference for the purpose of obviousness. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Shlecker* in view of *Saito*. As stated previously, the Office Action states that it appears from the instant specification that woven products of a tape comprising isotactic polypropylene having a tenacity of at least about 2.5 g/den typically exhibit a tenacity of within about 10.0% of the tenacity of the film product. However, the Office Action does not recite how the references teach, show or suggest such a feature. There must be some teaching in the prior art reference to anticipate a claim. Further, the statement of the Office Action is construing the present invention, which is referenced at page 14, as a teaching of the prior art. Paragraph 14 of the specification is clearly describing the features of the present invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In conclusion, Applicants submit that the references cited in the Office Action, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the claimed features. Having addressed all issues set out in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request the same.

Respectfully submitted,



Tenley R. Krueger
Registration No. 51,253
T.R. Krueger, P.C.

38 Hope Farm Road
Missouri City, Texas, 77459
Telephone: 281-778-8934
Facsimile: 281-778-8937
Attorney for Applicant(s)